

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/994,904	JORDAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Amended

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(3) _____.

(2) William Gustavson (Applicant's attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 June 2004

Time: 4:00 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Potential rejections of claims 19-21 over the prior art of record

Claims discussed:

1-12 and 19-21

Prior art documents discussed:

the prior art of record

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner stipulated that claim 19 as currently written does not distinguish over the prior art of record. Specifically, claim 19 as currently written only requires that the rod is rotatable on the bolt about the elongate axis of the collar. Such rotation is readable on a bolt having a threaded connection between the collar and rod as taught by the prior art of record. However, there is no suggestion or teaching in the prior art of record to provide a bolt that allows both rotation about the elongate axis of the collar and limited misalignment of the elongated axes of the rod and the collar as disclosed by the applicant. As such, in order to distinguish the applicant's invention over the prior art of record, the examiner proposed amending claim 19 to provide a bolt permitting limited misalignment of the elongated axes of the rod and the collar. The examiner further proposed changing the abstract to put it in the format set forth in the MPEP. During the telephone interview, the applicant's attorney approved the examiner's proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.